



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/898,285	07/02/2001	Ha Kyoong Lim	2060-3-04	2226
35884	7590	11/21/2005	EXAMINER	
LEE, HONG, DEGERMAN, KANG & SCHMADEKA, P.C. 801 SOUTH FIGUEROA STREET 14TH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90017			SINGH, RAMNANDAN P	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2646	

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/898,285	LIM, HA KYOON	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ramnandan Singh	2646	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 28 October 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: _____

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____

11. Continuation Sheet:

(i) Applicant's argument--" In contrast, Arimilli describes a data multiplexing network, but does not suggest internally generating a ring" on page 7

Examiner's response--Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant is directed to Paragraph 3 on page 5 of the Final Office action, dated July 26, 2005, wherein it is stated that the ring generation is inherently present in the interface, but not shown. For example, if a user picked up a handset of a standard telephone connected to the FXS interface at site "A", the telephone or fax machine at site "B" would ring [Para: 0055; 0053; 0056; 0067; 0070]. Further, Arimilli does teach using an analog exclusive line (313) [Para: 0003; 0042; 0048] with an FXO interface [Figs. 4B, 5A, 5B, 6C].

(ii) Applicant's argument--" Second, the ringback tone is generated in Koenig et al as a result of activating a self diagnostic test to verify channel functionality" on page 8.

Examiner's response---Examiner agrees. But, in addition to the above, Koenig et al also state " When Self Test is activated, each FXS channel also provides an internally-generated ringback tone to the telephone line" [col. 17, lines 12-14]. Further, Koenig et al teach a local ring generating unit (400), as shown in Fig. 4, operating in conjunction with the FXS interface [col. 21, lines 28-50]. It is nevertheless a teaching to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply this ring generating unit in conjunction with the FXS interface to other applications.

(iii) Applicant's argument---In particular, Applicant submits that the cited references do not teach or suggest an interface device using an analog exclusive line comprising a local ring generating unit for notifying a connection request signal of the FXO interface to the modem unit from within the interface device" on page 8.

Examiner's response-- Examiner respectfully disagrees. As shown above, since Arimilli teaches an analog exclusive line (313) having an FXO interface and generating a ring voltage (not shown), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the teachings of the local ring generating unit of Koenig et al with Arimilli to produce the claimed invention. Further, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Applicant is respectfully directed to the Final Office action, dated July 26, 2005



SINH TRAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER